

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 TERRY CORYELL,

11 Plaintiff(s),

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Dept. of
14 the Navy, et al.,

15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00593-GMN-NJK

Order

(Docket No. 38)

16 Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order
17 requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 38. The joint proposed discovery plan suffers
18 from numerous deficiencies.

19 First, the joint proposed discovery plan does not include the required statement that the
20 parties have met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute-resolution
21 processes, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(7). The joint proposed discovery plan also does not
22 include the required statement that the parties have considered consent to trial by a magistrate
23 judge, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(8).

24 Second, although the parties seek an extended discovery period, they measure the
25 discovery period from July 23, 2018, the date they filed the instant joint proposed discovery plan,
26 as opposed to June 6, 2018, the date the first Defendant answered or appeared. *Id.* at 2; *see also*
27 Docket No. 23. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1) requires that the discovery cut-off be measured from the
28 date the first Defendant appeared, not the date the parties filed their joint proposed discovery plan.

1 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' joint proposed discovery
2 plan. Docket No. 38. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than
3 July 30, 2018.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: July 24, 2018

6
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28